

Remarks

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 1, 2004. Claims 1 to 15 are currently in the application, with Claims 1, 5 and 9 being the independent claims. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Initially, Applicant thanks the Examiner for the courteous treatment afforded Applicant's undersigned representative during the telephonic interview conducted on December 22, 2004. During the interview, the claim amendments set forth above were discussed in light of U.S. Patent No. 5,596,570 (Soliman) and U.S. Patent No. 5,848,160 (Cai), which were applied in certain rejections in the Office Action. At the conclusion of the interview, it was agreed that the claims as shown above would overcome the current prior art rejections over Soliman and Cai. However, the Examiner indicated that he would need to confirm support for the amendments in the specification and that a further prior art search would be required.

Turning to the Office Action, the drawings were objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) for discrepancies in the reference signs used in the drawings and those mentioned in the specification. In response, Applicant has amended the specification and modified Figures 1 and 9 to correct the noted discrepancies. Specifically, a typographical error was corrected in the written description of Figure 3. In addition, reference numeral "21" was added to Figure 1 and reference numeral "24" was removed. Finally, reference numeral "53" was added to Figure 9. In view of these changes, withdrawal of the objections to the drawings is respectfully requested.

The Office Action further noted informalities in the Abstract of the Disclosure. Applicant has provided a new Abstract of the Disclosure to attend to the noted informalities.

Application No.: 10/080,560

With respect to the prior art rejections, Claims 1 and 4 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over Soliman; Claims 5 and 8 were rejected under § 102(b) over Cai; Claims 1, 9, 11, 12 and 15 were rejected under § 103(a) over Cai in view of Soliman; and Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 13 and 14 were rejected under § 103(a) over various combinations of Cai, Soliman, U.S. Patent No. 4,817,192 (Phillips), U.S. Patent No. 4,112,369 (Forman) and U.S. Patent No. 4,213,101 (Policand). As discussed above, the foregoing amendment is believed to overcome the rejections over Cai and Soliman. Applicant has reviewed Phillips, Forman and Policand and respectfully submits that none of these references are understood to disclose or suggest anything to remedy the deficiencies of Cai and Soliman. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 102(b) and § 103(a) rejections of Claims 1 to 15 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our Orange County office by telephone at (949) 851-0633. All correspondence should be directed to our address given below.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Andrew D. Mickelsen
Registration No. 50,957

18191 Von Karman Ave., Suite 400
Irvine, CA 92612-7107
Phone: 949.851.0633 ADM:wrj
Facsimile: 949.851.9348
Date: December 30, 2004

**Please recognize our Customer No. 31824
as our correspondence address.**